

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 27-31 are allowed.

Applicants' attorney again respectfully notes that the Information Disclosure Statement attached to the final office action only shows that the first reference in the statement has been initialed by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner confirm that all of the references have been considered.

Claims 6, 7, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Shi reference. Applicants respectfully submit that it appears that the rejection is using an improper definition of terminology in an effort to reject Applicants' claims. For example, the claims use the terms "first unit", "destination unit" and "authentication unit". These units are devices and are not software applications as the office action alleges. Applicants have amended the claims to include inherent language. For example, throughout the Specification, Applicants' Specification specifically states that the disclosed units are devices.

The Advisory Action alleges that Applicants' prior arguments were not persuasive because the claims did not include limitations drawn to hardware. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that the prior claims did refer to hardware and the current claims as amended do as well.

The office action alleges that the Shi reference teaches the claimed "authentication unit" as the "session manager". However, as noted in the cited portions of Shi, the session manager is in fact a software component "run by the work station computer 18" (column 6, line 18). As further stated in Shi, an example of the web server platform 12 includes a work station. As further noted in column 6, it states "The session manager 27 is thus invoked". As such, the session manager is not a device as required by the claim but to the contrary, is a

software application executed by the web server 18 (alleged first unit). Using the office action interpretation, (session manager is authentication unit and server 18 is first unit) Shi teaches that the alleged first unit contains and executes the alleged authentication unit. This is contrary to what is claimed.

Applicants claim communication among three different devices in a unique way which includes among other things, that the authentication unit receives from a first unit, user identification data to determine which destination unit of a plurality of destination units, other than the first unit, will receive an authentication code to be used to authenticate the user. Once the appropriate destination unit has been determined, the authentication code is sent to the determined destination unit based on the user ID data. The authentication code is returned back and the user is authenticated based on the returned authentication code when it matches the sent authentication code.

Shi describes a different system. Since the web server is alleged to be the claimed first unit and since the session manager is in the same device as the web server, there is no authentication unit in Shi that receives from a different unit, the user ID data. In fact, the Shi reference teaches that the same unit merely transfers user identification data to a software application of the same unit. Since the claim terms appear to have been mischaracterized and since the reference does not teach the claimed subject matter, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Other differences will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

Claims 3, 8 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi in view of McCann. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, claim 8 requires that per-user destination unit data is maintained that includes a destination unit identifier per user and using the user ID data to determine which destination unit will receive the

authentication code. The determined destination unit is based on the stored per-user destination unit identifier. As admitted in the office action, Shi discloses that the web server transmits a generated unique ID to the same client which requests services. (Page 6 of office action). However, the “client” in Shi is the same client that sends user identification data. (See cited portion, column 6, lines 28-29). As taught in Shi, it is the user and hence the client 10 that sends the user identification data. As such, the definition of “first unit” apparently used to reject these claims is the “client” of Shi. This interpretation is different from that promulgated above and as such, the claim is also in condition for allowance since a different definition of corresponding elements is being used to reject these claims.

It is also alleged that the reason one would combine McCann with Shi is that it would provide “reduced response time as taught by McCann”. However, Applicants’ claim is directed to utilizing a destination unit other than a first unit, as a mechanism to facilitate authentication. Neither reference alone or in combination contemplates such an operation. If the rejection is maintained, Applicants again respectfully request a showing as to how the alleged motivation is relevant to the claimed subject matter and further request an identification as to what corresponds to the claimed destination unit other than the first unit in either the Shi reference or the McCann reference.

Remaining claims 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi in view of Schneier. Applicants respectfully note that these claims are allowable at least as depending upon allowable base claims.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 16, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi in view of Rahman. Applicants respectfully submit that it appears that there is a misunderstanding of the Rahman reference. The Rahman reference is directed to a data session setup system for a wireless network and specifically defines a “forward link” as being a direction from which data is sent from a base station to a wireless unit. A “reverse

link” is the direction wherein a wireless unit sends or transmits information to a base station. (See column 1, lines 24-30). As such, a forward link and a reverse link are used as a same primary channel during communication to provide a bi-directional communication channel. Moreover, the Rahman reference is actually directed to a “session setup” invention as admitted in the office action. As such, information is communicated via a circuit switched link to “setup” another link. In contrast, claim 10 and other claims are actually referring to what occurs “during a session” and “during the same session” requiring that a communication link has already been established. As such, the Rahman reference and Applicants’ claim is directed to two totally different portions of operation.

Moreover, a “back channel” is not the same as a “reverse link” as alleged in the office action. As claimed, during a session, the claimed method actually requires the use of differing channels during the same session. The wireless back channel is an alternate channel from the primary channel and is used between different devices. The claims are not directed to a forward direction link and a reverse direction link of the same channel between the same device as taught in Rahman, but to the contrary, are directed to differing communication channels meaning that the back channel is not the regular or primary channel used to form the session and are set up between differing devices. Rahman describes a regular bi-directional forward and reverse communication channel between two of the same devices as known in the art. By way of example, Applicants’ Specification describes a primary channel as, for example, a wireless GSM or WCDMA channel and a back channel may be, for example, an SMS messaging channel. As such, a different device such as a pager or other device may be used to communicate an authentication code. In another embodiment, a radio telephone uses a primary wireless channel and a pager is sent the authentication code via a paging channel. As such, the reference does not teach the claimed subject matter.

Also, the Advisory Action alleges that the claims do not indicate that a back channel may be, for example, an SMS messaging channel. It appears that the claims again are being misapprehended. For example, claim 15 specifically states that the wireless back channel is a “short message session (SMS) channel” or a “paging channel” or a “control channel”. And as such, specifically states what the Advisory Action alleges is not claimed.

In addition, the Advisory Action alleges that Applicants are attempting to show non-obvious by attacking references individually in an improper manner. However, Applicants are merely addressing the reasons given for combining the references and the actual alleged teachings of the references. The references must be reviewed for what they teach. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above remarks as it appears that the unallowed claims are now in condition for allowance.

As taught in Rahman, different directional channels are used as the primary channel to establish an initial connection. In Rahman, by using a circuit switched link to send data session setup packets, the Rahman system attempts to avoid the delay associated with requesting and being allocated wireless resources and sending the setup packets using the packet switched link. Combining Rahman with that of Shi would simply result in a system of Shi which sent information back to the web browser apparently via a wireless network that employed the session setup operation described in Rahman. Neither reference alone or in combination contemplates the claimed subject matter and as such, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 12, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005